

harden of manufacturing and the foundations for industry. Today more than 700 new or rehabilitated factories—textile mills and cement plants, electronics and plastics—are changing the entire face of that nation. New roads and communications, railroad equipment, and electric generators are a spreading base on which this new industry can, and is, growing.

Progress in the midst of war

All this progress goes on, and it is going to continue to go on, under circumstances of staggering adversity.

Communist terrorists have made aid programs that we administer a very special target of their attack. They fear them, because agricultural stations are being destroyed and medical centers are being burned. More than 100 Vietnamese malaria fighters are dead. Our own AID officials have been wounded and kidnapped. These are not just the accidents of war. They are a part of a deliberate campaign, in the words of the Communists, "to cut the fingers off the hands of the Government."

We intend to continue, and we intend to increase our help to Vietnam.

Nor can anyone doubt the determination of the South Vietnamese themselves. They have lost more than 12,000 of their men since I became your President a little over a year ago.

But progress does not come from investment alone, or plans on a desk, or even the directives and the orders that we approve here in Washington. It takes men. Men must take the seed to the farmer. Men must teach the use of fertilizer. Men must help in harvest. Men must build the schools, and men must instruct the students. Men must carry medicine into the jungle, and treat the sick, and shelter the homeless. And men—brave, tireless, filled with love for their fellows—are doing this today. They are doing it through the long, hot, danger-filled Vietnamese days and the sultry nights.

The fullest glory must go, also, to those South Vietnamese that are laboring and dying for their own people and their own nation. In hospitals and schools, along the rice fields and the roads, they continue to labor, never knowing when death or terror may strike.

How incredible it is that there are a few who still say that the South Vietnamese do not want to continue the struggle. They are sacrificing and they are dying by the thousands. Their patient valor in the heavy presence of personal physical danger should be a helpful lesson to those of us who, here in America, only have to read about it, or hear about it on the television or radio.

We have our own heroes who labor at the works of peace in the midst of war. They toil unarmed and out of uniform. They know the humanity of their concern does not exempt them from the horrors of conflict, yet they go on from day to day. They bring food to the hungry over there. They supply the sick with necessary medicine. They help the farmer with his crops, families to find clean water, villages to receive the healing miracles of electricity. These are Americans who have joined our AID program and we welcome others to their ranks.

A call for aid

For most Americans this an easy war. Men fight and men suffer and men die. It always has in war. But the lives of most of us, at least those of us in this room and those listening to me this morning, are untroubled. Prosperity, peace, abundance increases, the Nation flourishes.

I will report to the Cabinet when I leave this room that we are in the 51st month of continued prosperity, the longest peacetime prosperity for America since our country was founded. Yet our entire future is at stake.

What a difference it would make if we could only call upon a small fraction of our unmatched private resources—businesses and unions, agricultural groups and builders—if we could call them to the task of peaceful progress in Vietnam. With such a spirit of patriotic sacrifice we might well strike an irresistible blow for freedom there and for freedom throughout the world.

I therefore hope that every person within the sound of my voice in this country this morning will look for ways—and these citizens of other nations who believe in humanity as we do, I hope that they will find ways to help progress in South Vietnam.

This, then, is the third face of our struggle in Vietnam. It was there—the illiterate, the hungry, the sick—before this war began. It will be there when peace comes to us—and so will we—not with soldiers and planes, not with bombs and bullets, but with all the wondrous weapons of peace in the 30th century.

And then, perhaps, together, all of the people of the world can share that gracious task with all the people of Vietnam, North and South alike.

HOPE FOR PEACE IN YEMEN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, at a time when a number of world issues are in crisis or in deadlock, it is gratifying to note an act of statesmanship and conciliation. I refer to President Nasser's decision to go to Saudi Arabia on August 22 to discuss the situation in Yemen with King Faisal. In preparation for his discussions with King Faisal, President Nasser has been meeting in Alexandria with Yemeni leaders in an effort to devise proposals for ending the festering Yemeni war.

In the meantime, tensions along the Saudi-Yemeni border, which until quite recently were rising, are now visibly abating. It is to be hoped that reduced hostilities will create a favorable atmosphere for peace negotiations.

President Nasser is often criticized in the United States for provocative actions and policies. It is fair and proper that we commend the President of the United Arab Republic when he takes conciliatory action for peace, as he is now doing with respect to Yemen.

Mr. President, I hope that the negotiations will turn out successfully, as it was a very dangerous situation in that area, and has been for some 3 years.

FURTHER AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the conference on the Foreign Assistance Act met 14 times before final agreement was reached on the text now before the Senate. As usual, the subject of foreign aid has been actively before the Senate in one form or another since March, a period of 8 months, and we have not yet acted on the appropriations bill.

I wish I could report to my colleagues that they would not need to begin the process all over again 3 or 4 months hence. But this is not the case because

the Senate conferees reluctantly—certainly, from my point of view, most reluctantly—were forced to accept those provisions of the House bill which authorized the program for only 1 more year.

Depressing as I personally find it to ask for approval of this conference report, nevertheless, I believe that it is possible we may have laid the groundwork for more thorough reforms next year. For the record, I wish to state that the Senate conferees, in agreeing with the House conferees to omit from this year's act Senate language authorizing a 2-year aid program and calling for a planning committee to study the basic principles underlying U.S. aid programs, placed reliance on the following factors. With respect to the 2-year authorization, the Senate conferees receded on the basis of:

First. The willingness of the House members of the committee of the conference to urge their House colleagues next year "to examine with the greatest care such proposals as may be submitted authorizing foreign aid programs for 2 or more years"; and

Second. The statement of the Secretary of State when he met with the Foreign Relations Committee on August 12, 1965, that next year "the administration expects to request that the multiyear principle adopted by the Congress in 1961 and 1962 for development lending be extended to include all other authorizations contained in the foreign aid bill to be proposed early in the next session of Congress."

I am hopeful that next year with the support of the administration and with the agreement of the House conferees, to examine a longer term authorization "with the greatest of care" that some headway may be made so we may get away from the dreary cycle of 1-year aid programs.

Throughout the conference, the House conferees reiterated time and time again that one of the reasons why they were unwilling to accept the amendment was that it was not requested by the administration. Whether that will be determinative, I do not know, but at least one step forward has been taken. Generally speaking, the administration's recommendations in these matters are given serious consideration by both bodies.

On the subject of the Senate's proposal to create a planning committee to examine the basic principles of foreign aid, the Senate receded on the basis of the following factors:

First. The statement of the conferees of both Houses urging the President to inaugurate a review of the aid program as presently constituted, seeking to direct it more effectively toward the solution of the problems of the developing countries, and

Second. The statement of the Secretary of State on the occasion referred to above that, despite its opposition to the creation of the foreign aid planning committee and certain other related provisions, nevertheless, the administration recognizes "the concern of the Senate about the future content and direction of the foreign aid program."

In this connection I may say that I have already requested our chief of staff of the committee to undertake preliminary preparations for a review of our aid programs by the committee. We have done this in the past in other fields. I am sure this can be very useful in this connection.

The Secretary of State added:

We would be very pleased to assist in any way we could any studies undertaken by the two legislative committees. In addition, the executive branch, prompted by these congressional concerns, will conduct a special study of the program, giving particular attention to the issues raised by this committee: the number of countries receiving assistance; the requirements for assistance and the prospects for achieving our objectives and terminating assistance; the contribution of other developed countries; and the appropriate relationships between bilateral and multilateral assistance.

On the subject of whether the national interest might better be served by increasing the proportion of development aid to be administered by the World Bank and related agencies, rather than solely through U.S. agencies, the Senate conferees were assured by the statement of the Secretary of State that the administration has asked the Appropriations Committee to "remove the prohibition in the Appropriations Act on the use of the authority of section 205 of the Foreign Assistance Act."

This provision in past AID appropriation acts has prohibited the effective use of certain percentages, in the past, 10 percent and under the present bill, 15 percent, of the Development Loan Fund to be made available to international development agencies.

I hope very much that the Appropriations Committee will follow the recommendations of the administration on this point and will not this year nullify the considered provision of the authorizing legislation specifying that not to exceed 15 percent of the Development Loan Fund may be used by the President through lending institutions such as the Bank and the International Development Association. This would enable the aid program to urge other free nations to help in the development process.

Secretary Rusk stated:

The executive branch and the Congress are in agreement on the desirability of enlarging the resources available to international aid-giving agencies on the basis of cost-sharing among the advanced countries. This is still our policy.

I regret that the Senate conferees were not able to prevail upon their House counterparts to accept this year the provisions of the so-called Morse amendment. That amendment would immediately have inaugurated a much needed review of the aid program. It provided clear mandates as to the desirability of interrupting aid continuity "in its present form." The series of basic principles set forth in that amendment went to the heart of the proliferation of country programs without tying these programs to principles by which we might have promoted a tightened definition of the national interest.

I also regret that we were not able to put the aid program on a 2-year basis, thus enabling the Committee on Foreign

Relations and the Senate to devote more time and attention to the many areas of foreign policy which need review and more modern mandates.

There were, of course, a number of other points in issue between the two Houses. This disposition of these issues is set forth in the conference report.

A number of loopholes were closed, including a blanket authorization provision which existed in the House bill.

The overall amount authorized in the bill and previous aid legislation is \$3.35 billion which is some \$97 million less than the administration asked for in March. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a table showing the disposition of the administration's request on an item by item basis.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

The following table shows the differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment, the sums agreed to by the committee of conference and the administration appropriation request for programs authorized in this bill and in existing law:

Foreign Assistance Act of 1965 (fiscal year 1966)

(In thousands of dollars)

	Executive appropriation request	House	Senate	Conference	Admin- istration request	Admin- istration request
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5) and (6)	(7) and (8)
Development Loan Fund	1,700,000	(1)	(1)	(1)		
Technical cooperation and development grants	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000		
For southeast Asia ¹	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000		
American schools and hospitals abroad	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000		
Alliance for Progress ²	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000		
Grants	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(-10,000)	(-10,000)
International organizations and programs	145,000	145,000	145,000	145,000		
Supporting assistance	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000		
For southeast Asia ³	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000		
Contingency fund ⁴	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000		
Military business	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000		
Administrative expenses	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000		
AID	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000		
State Department	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000		
Special authorization for southeast Asia ⁵	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000		
Total	3,420,000	3,420,000	3,420,000	3,420,000	+40,000	+40,000

¹ Existing law authorizes an appropriation of \$1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, plus unappropriated portions of amounts authorized for fiscal years 1964-65. The Senate amendment for fiscal year 1966 is \$700,000,000.

² The House bill contained an authorization for an appropriation for military and economic programs in southeast Asia of such sums as may be necessary in fiscal year 1966. This was added to the section of the law relating to the contingency fund. The Senate amendment added \$200,000,000 to the authorization for technical cooperation and \$20,000,000 to the authorization for supporting assistance to reflect the Executive request of \$220,000,000 for aid in southeast Asia.

³ Existing law authorizes an appropriation of \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 1966 against which the Executive has requested an appropriation of \$200,000,000. Neither the House bill nor the Senate amendment made any change in the total authorization for the Alliance for Progress for fiscal year 1966.

⁴ Existing law contains a continuing authorization for such sums as necessary. The Executive has requested an appropriation of \$10,000,000.

RECAPITULATION

Total amount of new authorizations contained in H.R. 1000: \$3,420,000,000

Appropriations requested against previous authorizations: \$40,000,000

Development Loan Fund: \$700,000,000

Alliance for Progress: \$2,000,000,000

State Department administrative expenses: \$10,000,000

Total authorized and requested for fiscal year 1966: \$3,460,000,000

Limitation on aggregate authorization for fiscal year 1966: \$3,420,000,000

Difference: \$40,000,000

NOTE.—The Senate amendment contained a limitation on the aggregate authorization for aid in fiscal year 1966 of \$3,380,000,000. The conferees agreed to a limitation of \$3,420,000,000.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Who is the acting majority leader at the present time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Fulbright).

Mr. MORSE. Who is the acting Republican minority leader?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would say that it is the Senator from California (Mr. Kuchel).

Mr. MORSE. There is quite a vacuum of empty seats. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KUCHEL TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT LEGISLATION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier today I had the honor of appearing before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and